9:22 am, Nov 01, 2019

**U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK** 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTLONG ISLAND OFFICE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 18-cr-00530-GRB-1

: U.S. Courthouse - versus -

: Central Islip, New York

CHRISTOPHER MCCOY, : July 25, 2019

Defendant : 11:00 AM

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE GARY R. BROWN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

#### PPEARANCES: Α

For the Government: Richard P. Donoghue, Esq.

United States Attorney

Lara Treinis Gatz, Esq. BY:

Assistant U.S. Attorney

100 Federal Plaza

Central Islip, NY 11722

For the Defendant: Edward V. Sapone, Esq.

William S. Petrillo, Esq.

Sapone & Petrillo, LLP

One Penn Plaza

Suite 5315

New York, NY 10019

Transcription Service: Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795

laferrara44@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

1 THE CLERK: Calling Case 18-cr-530, United 2 States of America v. Christopher McCoy.

3 Counsel, please state your appearance for the record.

MS. GATZ: Good morning, your Honor.

Lara Treinis Gatz for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Gatz.

MR. SAPONE: And good morning, your Honor.

Edward Sapone, and my partner, William Petrillo for Christopher McCoy, ready for sentencing.

11 THE COURT: All right. Everyone's ready to 12 proceed?

MR. SAPONE: Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. I have a few preliminary questions before we get to it. The first of which is this, at the plea, which I recall quite well, we had a long discussion about whether or not the defendant needed to register as a sex offender. It was in the plea agreement, and then I believe during the plea, we agreed to pull it out because counsel thought no.

> MR. SAPONE: Yes.

THE COURT: It looks like that might not be the In other words, the probation department thinks that registration's required.

So I guess the best thing to ask you at this

1 moment, counsel, is based on that, would your client want
2 to withdraw his quilty plea?

MR. SAPONE: So he would not, your Honor. If I could be heard on this issue, I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Help yourself.

MR. SAPONE: Sure. So it's our understanding that there is no analogous statute in New York State, and so as long as Mr. McCoy remains in New York State, there's no registration under SONAR, because there's no analogous statute. We believe that.

We've checked into that, probation looked into it, and so did we, and that's the state of affairs. The question is, we were just, and we were just discussing it in the hallway, let's say Mr. McCoy moves, he moves to Massachusetts, for argument's sake --

THE COURT: Uh-hum.

MR. SAPONE: -- then what we're suggesting is he lets that jurisdiction know about the conviction, and let's them weigh in on whether or not they think he should be registered. And I think that's where the parties are at on this issue.

THE COURT: Ms. Gatz?

MS. GATZ: Your Honor, I'm going to ask Ms. Langone speak to that. She's researched this pretty thoroughly, and I think she can explain to the Court

1 | what's going to happen via statute in New York, and --

THE COURT: Ms. Langone?

MS. GATZ: -- which I think is of primary concern to the Court.

THE COURT: You can sit. Use the mic because we're making a record.

MS. LANGONE: Okay. Yes. So there is the federal SONAR guidelines, the statute that requires that individuals with certain convictions notify the states in which they reside, and let the state determine. There is not currently a federal registry. So it's left to each state to determine whether or not a conviction requires registration in that state.

Under the federal SONAR, the conduct falls under a conviction that would require him to make that notification to the State. So in New York State, we will send the notification of the conviction while he is on supervised release. However, there is not a statute in New York State that is analogous to the offense of conviction, so more than likely, New York State is going to notify us that this is not registerable in New York State.

However, each state has their own list of offenses, and should he decide to move, because of that federal SONAR, he will be required to notify the

jurisdiction where he resides, and let them determine if
in their jurisdiction, it is a registerable offense.

here, too, which may be I don't think this is my determination to make, but I don't want your client walking away with the impression that there's been some decision that he doesn't have to register. It sounds to me like someone else will make that decision, this state or another state, right? I want him to be clear that a collateral consequence, and it's a serious consequence, of this plea and conviction, may be registration, so I am going to offer you the opportunity once again, to withdraw the plea if that's what you want.

MR. SAPONE: So we respectfully decline that offer, and I think we're on the same page, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so long as he is clear.

MR. SAPONE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Because it's a serious matter. I don't want him walking away with the wrong impression.

MR. SAPONE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SAPONE: We appreciate it, your Honor.

23 | Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. And while I will address
this later in the proceeding, I have a preliminary issue

regarding restitution. My understanding is that the victim did not file a registration -- a victim impact statement, but may have filed a civil action, if I read that correctly.

Ms. Gatz, where are on that?

MS. GATZ: Your Honor, victim notification was made as required. The victim has declined to participate in today's proceedings, and has not submitted, as I understand it, a victim notification to -- excuse me, a victim statement to the probation department or the Court.

THE COURT: So probation advises I could schedule a restitution hearing later, but there's a Second Circuit case from 1994, the last century, not recent, but it says you can't do that. You have to do it at the time.

MS. GATZ: We're not pursuing restitution in this matter, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So there's no sort of presumptive number, there's nothing like I'm just going to leave that alone, yes?

MS. GATZ: No, your Honor. That's correct.

THE COURT: Do you agree?

MR. SAPONE: We agree. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. I mean, restitution is

```
Proceedings
 1
   mandatory but since I have no information on that, I
 2
   cannot make a determination.
              MR. SAPONE: Correct.
 3
              THE COURT: Okav.
 4
 5
              MR. SAPONE: Thank you.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. Those are my
 7
   preliminary issues. Let's get started.
 8
              First of all, counsel, has your client
 9
   reviewed, and discussed the pre-sentence report?
10
              MR. SAPONE: We have, your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. McCoy, is that
12
   right?
13
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
14
              THE COURT: Any other questions? Any other
15
   issues we need to resolve about that fact, in other
16
   words, that you had ample time to talk about it?
17
              MR. SAPONE: We've had ample time, and there
18
   are no issues, your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: Good. Are there any issues in
20
   dispute concerning the sentencing guidelines?
21
              MR. SAPONE: No, your Honor.
22
```

THE COURT: So the guidelines range is if I am recalling, I don't have it in front of me, 29. We're agreed on that?

23

24

25

MR. SAPONE: One moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know it's criminal history

category one, but I just want to make sure I've got the

right number.

MR. SAPONE: Yes, and that's after acceptance, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. So for --

MR. SAPONE: 29, CHC 1.

THE COURT: Right. No other factual issues need to be resolved regarding that. We're agreed it's a 29 at level 1.

MR. SAPONE: Correct.

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

12 THE COURT: And that suggests a guidelines 13 range of 87 to 108 months.

MR. SAPONE: Yes, so in a post-Booker world, the advisory guidelines range is that this is a misdemeanor with a one-year cap.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it. Any other legal issues relating to the sentence that we need to discuss?

MS. GATZ: No, your Honor.

MR. SAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to agree then with the probation department's determination that and with the consent of the parties, that it is a level 29, with an 87 to 108 advisory range. So counsel, I have reviewed the significant submission you made, right? I

1 think it's 108 pages, if I have that right, something
2 like that.

MR. SAPONE: You know, we're not lost for words, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, no, no, I got you. There's a lot of letters. It's -- I read everything. What would like to do now?

MR. SAPONE: So I would like to be brief, if I may, and I appreciate that your Honor took the time to read all that.

I am -- we are struck by the volume of letters. They speak to Mr. McCoy's history and characteristics quite well, much better than counsel ever could. I just wanted to sort of reiterate that we sentence people, not crimes. We sentence not just people, but the whole person. Mr. McCoy, I would like to state publicly, has been an excellent father to his three children, ages 9, 7, and 5.

I was touched by the fact that he was a chaperone at many school trips, volunteered at the school, coached T-ball and when the kids got older, Little League. Drew little pictures for them when they went to school in the morning; just an excellent father.

We obviously are well aware of the misconduct, and never to be condoned, but again, we look at the whole

person and just very briefly would like to mention that for more than ten years, aside from the instant offense, did honorably serve our community. He made more than 250 good arrests, and received numerous awards and commendations.

I'll end with this, your Honor, and I'm thinking about United States v. Gall, where Mr. Gall had engaged in what the Court -- the U.S. Supreme Court described as self-rehabilitation. That is, no court had ordered Mr. Gall to do anything, and on his own, he sought to rehabilitate himself. And here, Mr. McCoy has done similarly.

He went to numerous doctors, mental health professionals on his own. He sought and received treatment. Your Honor saw the reports from, I think it was Dr. John Dougherty, as well as licensed clinical social worker, Mark Williams. There are numerous quotes in the memorandum about that.

And so I appreciate your time. I'm here for any questions but I think we'll, at this point, rest on our submission.

THE COURT: And counsel, it's a fine submission. I mean this is a difficult case. It's a little puzzling to me to get so many letters given the nature of the conduct, right, but getting letters from

friends, and spouse, and family -- well, not spouse, family, colleagues, others, acquaintances of fellow officers, attesting to his good character.

How do I reconcile that with what happened, right?

MR. SAPONE: Because I think that -- and this is a movie I might've seen a decade ago, and in the movie it said, I don't know if it was Shawshank Redemption, not to draw any parallels between this case and that, sometimes good people do not so good things. I think that we are complex and a man could be in his middle age, right, a middle-aged man in his middle years, and live a lifetime of good work, and hard work, and be a great father, and love his family, many of whom are here in court, his Dad, his brothers, and then there's a hiccup in life, and there's misconduct, and you scratch your head, and you wonder how, why, how could that have happened? Sometimes there are not.

But a man is not defined by his mistakes. I would like to think that we could look at the whole person, and so those people are not wrong when they say the things they say about Christopher because he is all those things, and more, notwithstanding the misconduct.

THE COURT: Yes. I don't want to get into too

many details about his sort of mental health history, and so forth, except to say that one of the elements that the licensed social worker presented in the report is lying to friends and colleagues about sexual activity, so -- and keeping -- what was the phrase -- keeps the secret from all the world, right?

MR. SAPONE: Yes, so perhaps --

THE COURT: It kind of helps me understand why I'm getting lots of fine, you know, attestations about his good character from people whom he presumably told none about any of this, fair?

MR. SAPONE: Yes, your Honor. It is, and you're correct to pick up on that, and what I would say is if people in the community who have a problem, whatever it may be --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SAPONE: -- it could be an addiction, it could be a mental health issue, it could be anything, if they turn to their friends and family, and say hey, I'm in a bad way, all right, I'm in a dark place, I need help, then maybe we'd all be all the better for it. But unfortunately, usually attendant to the problem is the masking, and they're not stepping forward, and seeking the help they need before the act was committed. If they had done that, we wouldn't be here, and perhaps Mr.

- 1 Petrillo and I wouldn't have a job.
- THE COURT: Got it. And then the other
- 3 question that the social worker report raises in my mind,
- 4 | is one of the causal factors that are identified is the
- 5 | flirtatious behavior of the complainant.
- Now I don't know of any evidence of that. Is
- 7 | there evidence of that?
- MR. SAPONE: So your Honor, I -- you know,
- 9 there's a phrase in our business, "blaming the victim",
- 10 and --
- 11 THE COURT: Yeah.
- MR. SAPONE: -- my law firm doesn't do that. I
- 13 also don't micro manage mental health expert's reports.
- 14 THE COURT: I hear you.
- MR. SAPONE: And so, you know, the expert wrote
- 16 what he wrote. That's not my statement. That's not Mr.
- 17 | Petrillo's statement.
- 18 THE COURT: Well, that second part is
- 19 problematic, right, because this report is based on
- 20 comprehensive interviewing of a -- he calls him Chris all
- 21 the time, he uses his first name for mental health
- 22 | reasons that are -- allude me, but I have to believe that
- 23 | that information came from your client because there's no
- 24 other source for it. Isn't that fair?
- MR. SAPONE: You know, I don't know what Mr.

1 Williams did in his extensive investigation. I know he 2 spoke not only to Christopher but to many family members, 3 you know? Mark Williams doesn't just speak to the defendant. He goes out there. He pulls news articles. 4 5 I don't know what he did, your Honor, but --6 THE COURT: All right, so --7 MR. SAPONE: -- counsel is not making that 8 statement. 9 THE COURT: Does this rise to the level of 10 diminished capacity, I guess is my question? 11 MR. SAPONE: No, it does not. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Is there a ground, and you 13 were very careful properly to say that they're advisory 14 quidelines but is there -- so but we used to call it a 15 departure, is there a departure ground here? 16 MR. SAPONE: No, and so you know my 17 understanding of modern day sentencing goes something 18 like this. We calculate the appropriate sentencing 19 guidelines. Those guidelines are merely advisory. The 20 Court takes a look at those guidelines, and then 21 determines a sentence that meets the parsimony clause, 22 that is a sentence that is sufficient, but not greater 23 than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing as set 24 forth in 18 USC Section 3553(a)(2), and sentences within 25 the statutory minimum and maximum, calculating those

- 1 | guidelines, looking at the seven factors of 3553(a).
- 2 Here, the statutory mandatory minimum is zero.
- 3 | The maximum is one year.
- 4 THE COURT: Uh-hum.
- 5 MR. SAPONE: And so the guidelines, in effect,
- 6 are one year because that's the statutory max.
- 7 THE COURT: Right, of course, but the question
- 8 I have for you, are you asking for something less than
- 9 that because I thought the agreement --
- 10 MR. SAPONE: The plea agreement would preclude
- 11 | that, and I respect Ms. Gatz.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. SAPONE: We've had many cases together. I
- 14 respect her professionalism.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. SAPONE: I would never do such a thing.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
- 18 MR. SAPONE: Yes.
- 19 THE COURT: All right, then. I'm obviously
- 20 considering all the 3553(a) factors, including the
- 21 guidelines in reaching a conclusion here. Are there any
- 22 other comments you would like to make on behalf of the
- 23 defendant?
- MR. SAPONE: So your Honor the other issue is
- 25 whether or not the defendant would like to make a

1 | statement.

THE COURT: I will get there in a second, but yeah, sure.

MR. SAPONE: Here -- yes, your Honor -- here, it's my understanding as you correctly point out, that the claimant is suing the municipality, and so on the advice of counsel, given that lawsuit, with your permission, he's going to respectfully remain silent at this point.

There are some housekeeping issues, which I think I will reserve for the end. So for now, in terms of argument at sentencing, we're not.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McCoy, I just want to make sure that you're clear on the fact that you're free to speak to me now if you would like.

You understand that, yes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: But you would rather pass, and that's okay if you want to pass but it's up to you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Gatz, any comments would you like to make before I impose sentence?

MS. GATZ: Yes, your Honor. Obviously, you've read all of the papers and you're very familiar with this case, and you understand this is complex, and a

complicated case. A simple set of facts, so-to-speak, but a complicated case nonetheless.

The defendant was originally charged with a felony, which I think bears some discussion here, and I want the Court to understand that the victim's credibility had no play in the decision to offer a misdemeanor in this matter. It was a legal decision, not a factual decision. And the legal decision was because the traditional definition of force that is used in these types of cases, this is a civil rights case, and it's a deprivation of a victim's civil rights, meaning the rights would be free from unwanted sexual contact.

In a case like this, the way to prove force is beyond a reasonable doubt to a jury, the facts here, coupled with the law, did not rise to that level, and I think it's important to understand that.

This is a case of a disparate power dynamic between two people. This is case in which the defendant used his authority to get the victim alone into a particular location.

And even in a power dynamic, the victim in this case felt pressured, and felt she had no other choice but to engage in the sexual contact.

And I believe the Court hit the nail on the head in terms of the expert reports, too. It was that

certainly the expert report of Mr. Williams did blame the victim, describing her as flirtatious, and basically indicating that the defendant "resist sexual temptation". And I don't blame the defendant for that because I have no understanding or reason to believe that he's the one that presented those facts. I don't know where they came from but I certainly object to their use, and I think that the expert sorely missed the mark in this report.

I think from my perspective, after investigating this case, I think the defendant had a warped view of his encounters with people. He certainly thought that this wanted this but she didn't, and I think that her actions spoke to that, and he declined to recognize that she did not want to do this, and he forced her, and not in a traditional sense. There was no gun to her head. There was no you better do this or else, there was a lot of unspoken communication between a police officer, and arrestee, where this woman felt she had no choice but to comply with what the defendant wanted.

And I also -- I must say also, the other expert missed the mark, too in frankly, from my view, blaming his wife for her actions that somehow contributed to what the defendant did, and I find that offensive as well. I think both the experts missed the mark in this case. And certainly that's no knock on either the defendant or

- 1 counsel, who have conducted themselves in a very
  2 professional way, in a very complicated and important and
  3 stressful, and embarrassing case.
  - So I certainly am not knocking the defendant or their lawyers. I think they've conducted themselves in a very appropriate manner, given the complex, and complicated case that this turned out to me.
  - I certainly think that this resolution is the appropriate resolution to this matter, and I asked the Court to impose a sentence that all of the parties have agreed upon.
- Can I just have one moment, your Honor?
- 13 THE COURT: Sure.
- 14 (Pause)
- MS. GATZ: Nothing else, your Honor. Thank
- 16 you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- MR. SAPONE: Your Honor, if I may?
- 18 THE COURT: Sure.
- MR. SAPONE: So I have no response to what Ms.
- 20 | Gatz said at all. I have another issue which is Joe
- 21 McCoy, Christopher's father, is here in court and his two
- 22 brothers, and they had asked me could they make some
- 23 | brief comments to the Court, and what I said to them was
- 24 | sometimes judges say hey, I got 50 letters, and I read a
- 25 | voluminous sentencing memorandum, I have enough

information to impose sentence. Other times, judges say sure, step right up. They had asked me to ask your Honor permission, and it's up to the Court.

THE COURT: If I am going to say -- answer both, which is I have plenty of information but if they would like to be heard, I would be pleased to hear from them. So they can step up to the podium.

MR. SAPONE: Great. And this is not a case, your Honor, where I've prepared with them. There's no  ${\tt Q}$  and A. They just want to make a statement.

THE COURT: Yes, yes, absolutely, please.

MR. SAPONE: Okay. And I would just ask that you identify yourself for the record.

THE COURT: Thank you. Step over to the podium. There's a microphone there, and that's how we're making a record, okay?

MR. D. MCCOY: Yes.

THE COURT: Who are you, sir?

MR. D. MCCOY: I am David McCoy.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. D. MCCOY: Chris' brother. Good day, your Honor. I'm Chris' younger brother David. Whew. I've looked up to Chris my entire life, as a role model. He's hard-working, inspirational and always been there for me when I needed him. So much so that I made him the

1 godfather of my son, James.

Through God, I look for answers to how to help my brother regain some sense of normalcy in his life.

I've watched him suffer for over two years now, and remorsefully struggle to get by day to day. He's lost friendships, families, and his career. He will always be my big brother, an outstanding father, and an honorable man.

And I know that he will right all his wrongs, and regain his life, and I ask for any leniency possible for my brother, to allow him to raise his children to be productive members of our society, which I know they will become.

Chris, I love you, more now than ever. I will always have your back, and you're always going to get through this with the help of your friends and family, and become a better version of the great man you already are. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else like to be heard?

MR. J. MCCOY: Good morning, your Honor. I'm Joe McCoy. I'm Chris' oldest sibling. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my brother, Chris.

Growing up in our house, Chris was always a caring, happy, funny boy, always sensing when someone

could use a laugh or a hug to cheer them up. As years went by, I watched my caring, witty, little brother grow into a determined, dedicated, mature, hard worker who gave his all to be a successful student, athlete and person.

I also saw that Chris was always more concerned about the success of others above his own. This was evident by his four years as a walk-on on the Clemson University football team. He knew that he would never see the field during a game, but gave everything to that team as part of the practice squad to help them prepare.

In all aspects of his life, Chris has been a team player, doing his best for the team, whether it be his classmates, fellow police officers, or his family to succeed.

Chris is always there to lend a hand, at whether helping you move, paint a room, check in on an ailing family member, but if you ask any of Chris' friends, they would have similar stories of how he makes time to help or care for those close to him.

Chris is a great uncle to his three nieces and five nephews. He always makes time to attend birthday parties, and special events all over the tri-state area. He patiently listens to Little League stories, and is never too busy for a water balloon fight, or a backyard

1 obstacle course.

I know that my own children are devastated by the thought of not having Uncle Chris around, and I cannot imagine how his own children will handle it.

Chris is a wonderful father. He's incredibly patient, loving, and compassionate with his three children. There have been many times over the last nine years when I've learned how to be a better Dad by watching my younger brother Chris.

His children are everything to him. He is completely and totally involved in every aspect of their lives, and has been since the day his oldest son was born. Hawk, Liam, and Emmy (ph.) need their father in their lives, and they're better off for having him as a Dad.

After Chris' arrest two-and-a-half years ago, he could have easily become angry, and bitter, and fallen apart but he didn't. Instead, Chris did everything he could to keep his family together. He used his time productively, spending as much time as possible with his children and his wife, helping our parents out whenever he could, and picking up whatever jobs he could to help his family, whereas many men would've let this experience destroy them. Chris has truly tried to grow from this experience, and I'm very proud of him.

I would ask the Court to take this into consideration today when you sentence my brother. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

MR. SAPONE: Yes, his father, your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  JOE MCCOY: It just takes me a minute to get there, your Honor.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. JOE MCCOY: Good morning, your Honor. My name is Joe McCoy. I'm the father of Christopher,

Joseph, Brian, David and Katie (ph.). Let me start by saying that no father could be prouder of his children than I have been.

Chris' actions in this particular case are a complete aberration, and quite frankly, I had a hard time understanding how. Chris has always been a wonderful person. As your Honor read in the reports, he suffers from OCD, and we used to joke with him about that all the time. When he went to Clemson, his classmates used to pick on him by moving his pencils in different directions. They'd turn his hangars around, and it would drive him crazy.

But he was always there for everybody. He was a great son. I can't say more than that. A couple of years ago, I did notice something that was mentioned

peripherally in the report, and I would just like to mention it. Chris started having, I guess what the psychologist called panic attacks. I took him to the hospital a number of times where he couldn't breathe. He was checked in overnight. Everybody thought he was having a heart attack.

I see from the psychiatrist's report that this could be a contributing factor, and you know Chris just had that particular problem.

But getting back to the present situation,

Chris has three of the greatest children that you can

possibly have. I'm blessed with ten grandchildren, and

I'll tell you what, I love each and every one of them.

They're fantastic.

Chris' Hawk, who is 9, Liam, who is 7, and Emmy, who is 5, they absolutely, positively rely on their father to keep the family together, to take care of them, to give them guidance. I honestly, truthfully, your Honor, under oath if you want me, state that I don't know how those children will survive should Chris be incarcerated or go away.

I am here as a plea for them, for Chris, and I would just like to ask a question, it's a rhetorical question obviously, and that is, how is society served by incarcerating a person who has made a mistake? This is

America. Land where people get second chances. Land where people get opportunities. And incarcerating Chris, in my opinion, and obviously it's a biased and slanted one, serves no purpose. It hurts three innocent children severely. Chris -- and I say this as far as that sentence goes -- this started in March of 2017. For two-and-a-half years Chris has suffered with the Sword of Damocles banging over his head. He's been unable to get a permanent position. He's become a day laborer to get money wherever he could to help the family.

And you know, that -- I don't understand how two-and-a-half years under this intense pressure, this emotional stress, and everything else, could not be taken into account by the Court as some sort of time served, if you will.

In any event, that's what I hope, and I just mention to your Honor that I wrote down the definition of justice out of the legal dictionary and it says, and I quote, "The proper administration of the law. The fair and equitable treatment of all individuals under the law, fairness."

Please, your Honor, take into consideration everything that was in that memorandum. My son made a huge mistake. No getting around that. But the entire family is there to help him, and we know that Chris will

1 become again a valued member of society, and his 2 community. So please take that into consideration, your 3 Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 4 5

Anything further, counsel?

MR. SAPONE: No, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further from the

government?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GATZ: Your Honor, I appreciate Mr. McCoy's comments. He's been at every court appearance and he's clearly the kind of father everybody should have but to answer his rhetorical question, there's two things the Court should be thinking about; general deterrence, sending the message to other police officers or other people in this type of power disparity, you can't act this way. It doesn't matter that you're having problems. It doesn't matter that you are suffering from issues. You can't treat people this way.

And specific deterrence; the report seem to say this is never going to happen again. I don't have a crystal ball. I can't tell but I think that the idea of spending time in jail is a significant deterrence to future conduct by this defendant. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further, counsel?

MR. SAPONE: Just some housekeeping matters

1 | whenever the Court is ready for me.

THE COURT: Have at it.

MR. SAPONE: All right. So in terms of -
well, I think I should wait until you're done pronouncing

sentence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SAPONE: Yes.

THE COURT: The pretrial or the probation department gave me a sentencing recommendation. You've seen that counsel, yes?

MR. SAPONE: We've talked about it in the hallway, your Honor.

MS. GATZ: I think we should -- if the Court -- probation doesn't give these to the parties unless you order it, so I would appreciate if you could order that now, so we could have them.

THE COURT: Yeah, why don't you give them to the parties? Take a few minutes to review it. I have -- okay, let me say something very clearly. I have reviewed it. It's, I guess part of my thinking though I am not specifically relying on it, but if you review it, there may be a few shortcuts we can take in terms of different aspects of this. So why don't you give that to them, please?

MS. LANGONE: Your Honor, we would need to just

specify, do you want the parties to have the entire recommendation or just the conditions that we recommended be a part of the term of supervision?

THE COURT: Give them the entire recommendation.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24

MS. LANGONE: The entire --

THE COURT: If it's something you've given me,
I think they should see it.

MS. LANGONE: And your Honor also, they're -in reviewing for sentence today, there was one condition
that we would like to request that we failed to include
in the recommendation. I brought the language up for
that condition, as well, for everyone to review. It
would be that during the period of his supervision, that
he be subject to the computer and internet monitoring
program, as he contacted the victim via text messages
following the offense, and we have also recommended that
he not be permitted to contact the victim in any way.
This would be the manner --

20 THE COURT: That's in the document, so

THE COURT: That's in the document, so that that part is okay, yes?

MS. LANGONE: Yes, that's all in the document.

23 The only thing that we omitted from --

THE COURT: You want computer monitoring.

MS. LANGONE: The computer monitoring.

- THE COURT: Okay. Please provide the document to counsel. I'll be back momentarily, and we can proceed from there.
- 4 MS. LANGONE: All right.
- 5 (Off the record)
- THE COURT: We're back on.
- Counsel, did you have sufficient time to review that, and did you review it with your client?
- 9 MR. SAPONE: Yes, your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: Did you have any issues as a result
- 11 of that document?
- MR. SAPONE: Yes, your Honor.
- 13 THE COURT: All right. Have at it.
- 14 MR. SAPONE: All right. So just that I am
- 15 | clear, we didn't get advance notice of it, which is fine
- 16 because we did speak in the hallway. I did read it now.
- 17 I went over it with Mr. McCoy. We've had sufficient
- 18 time.
- 19 THE COURT: Counsel, stop right there.
- MR. SAPONE: Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: If you want an adjournment for a
- 22 different day or this afternoon, I will do anything you
- 23 | want. You tell me.
- MR. SAPONE: We've had plenty of time.
- 25 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SAPONE: Okay. So my view point is this, your Honor, as to the computer monitoring prong of the supervised release, it says here on page 4, the last paragraph --

THE COURT: Uh-hum.

MR. SAPONE: -- "As Jane Doe was victimized in the instant offense, and was then subject to text messages from the defendant, referencing the sexual contact, a special condition of supervision has been recommended, prohibiting the defendant from contacting Jane Doe in any manner."

We agree with that completely, and so therefore, we're asking your Honor not to find it necessary that in addition to that, that there's computer monitoring because it's obvious to us that the reason for the computer monitoring condition is because Mr. McCoy contacted her by text message.

But to deal with that, he's not allowed to contact her in a manner. He didn't use a computer in this case. This is not a case where there's any traditional misconduct, if you will, that would trigger the computer monitoring. So we think it's inappropriate in this case, and it could be dealt with by the paragraph I just read. All right, so -- yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Gatz?

MS. GATZ: Your Honor, I support the probation department's recommendation. I think if they feel it's necessary to supervise him for a year, I think that the Court should impose that. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LANGONE: Your Honor? I'm sorry, if you want further explanation as to why we are --

THE COURT: I'm good.

MS. LANGONE: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Go ahead.

MR. SAPONE: All right. And so there's a condition here that he be polygraphed, and my only concern with that is that, you know, we've had a lot of experience with polygraphers, and you know it depends on a lot of factors. We think it's unreliable, and again, not necessary.

There are plenty of conditions here -- plenty of conditions to monitor him, and we don't agree with the polygraph aspect of it.

One moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: Hang on one second. Counsel, what do you say about that?

MS. LANGONE: Your Honor, the polygraph in and of itself is not used to form the basis of a violation.

It is a way to foster truthful communication about the subject matter that's being dealt with in treatment.

As it was alluded to earlier, there is some question as to whether or not there's a truthful account of sexual conduct. Polygraph is a means to further that discussion. And again, a violation in and of itself is not brought before the Court because of a failed polygraph. More likely than not, it will lead to further discussion and further communication to find out the cause of the failure, which may or may not trigger a violation to be considered before the Court. Failing the test alone is not the reason why we would come back before the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, counsel?

MR. SAPONE: Yes, your Honor. So on the first page of the recommendation, the last paragraph --

THE COURT: Uh-hum.

MR. SAPONE: -- "The defendant shall not obtain a position of employment which allows him to have custody or control of over others, adults or minors."

We think that that is vague. I don't really know exactly what that means. I think it's a case by case basis as to whether or not let's say a certain managerial position would equate to custody or control. I think that a cleaner way to do it, your Honor, is that

- he shall not be permitted to become employed as a
  security guard or a security officer, which we would
  consent to.
- THE COURT: Are we looking for law enforcement there; is that the point?
- MS. GATZ: Yes, your Honor, but I think what -I think if you want to modify it to that language, that's
  fine but I think the idea would be to check with pretrial
  or probation before he takes employment, and we can
  discuss it at that point. So that's fine to modify it in
  that fashion, but I do think that before taking
  employment, he's going to have to run that by his
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.

probation officer --

- MS. GATZ: -- to determine the suitability of the job, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Right. I know, I understand. I am just running through my head, what are the variations,
- 19 right? Is it if we say law enforcement or law
- 20 enforcement-type position, does that cover what we're
- 21 looking for or not really?
- MS. GATZ: One moment.
- 23 (Pause)

13

- MS. GATZ: That's fine, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. And of course, to the extent

```
1
   that that condition applies, the probation department is
 2
   not stopped from bringing anything forward to the Court
 3
   that may -- that we're not thinking of today, right?
   other words, we got this kind of job, and it may not be
 4
 5
   great, and we can revisit it then. Fair enough?
 6
              MR. SAPONE: We can always take things up in
 7
    the future.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay, good. All right.
 9
              Anything further?
10
    (Pause)
11
              MR. SAPONE: No, thank you, your Honor, and
    thank you for all the time you've put into this.
12
              THE COURT: No, problem.
13
14
              Ms. Gatz, anything else?
15
              MS. GATZ: No, your Honor, thank you.
16
              THE COURT: All right. Then I am ready to
17
    impose sentence. Like every criminal case, this case is
18
   tragedy for everyone involved. The conduct was
19
   reprehensible. The impact on the families -- on the
20
   victim was unimaginable. The impact on this defendant's
21
    family, extended family, some who are here today, is
22
   terrible, but that's always the case.
23
              So I am going to talk about the -- what I've
24
   considered in connection with the -- let's start with the
25
   period of incarceration. So counsel raised a lot of
```

issues concerning the defendant's state of mind, background, character. I've considered all of those things.

If this were a case where the pending charge were a felony, the decision would be much more difficult. However, in this case, the guidelines do represent something the Court must consider, and I think are a fair starting point.

Is this a case that would warrant a departure from the guidelines? No. Would it warrant a variance, I think that's the new phrase, from the guidelines? Maybe. But what I can be certain of is it certainly wouldn't warrant a variance that would go below the statutory maximum of this case. So in other words, we're not going to reduce him from 87 to something less than 12 months.

So I find that a one-year period of incarceration is appropriate, in considering all of the factors under 3553(a). I believe that is sufficient, though not beyond the requirements of that section. It is not greater than what is required to specifically -- particularly achieve specific and general deterrence here.

That will be followed by one year of supervised release, and that period will be governed by the conditions contained in the probation department's

recommendation with the exception of the computer monitoring. I agree with counsel that the situation here does not warrant computer monitoring. I think it's for a different type of situation and case, but I do agree with probation that polygraphy may be an appropriate tool in this case, particularly given the level of deceit that went on, including right up to the time of, I think, deceit with his treatment therapist, and so forth.

I am not imposing restitution because there is no victim impact statement here. Of course, that will be without prejudice to the victim pursuing whatever rights she may or may not have in parallel civil proceedings.

I am not imposing a fine due to the -- due to many factors, but including the defendant's obligations to his young children, which the family has brought to my attention, and so I think any spare income he has will be used for those obligations.

There's a \$25 special assessment that must be imposed at this time. And we will alter the language of the position of employment issue to cover law enforcement or law enforcement-type positions, as well as the fact that probation can bring any other issue -- jobs that may be an issue to the attention of the Court.

Is there anything I neglected to cover?
MS. GATZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MR. SAPONE: No, your Honor. But if I may at this time, ask your Honor that Mr. McCoy be -- that your Honor recommend FCI-Otisville has a camp, and the reason I am asking for that recommendation, it's not binding on the BOP, but they appreciate Court's recommendations, is it's the only facility that's close enough where he might be able to see his three children. If he's designated anywhere else, his wife will not take the children to see him. And so they would be deprived of a very, very strong relationship with their father, who is the one that wakes them up in the morning, puts them to bed at night. It's going to be very traumatic to begin with.

I don't want to see a situation where he doesn't see them for a year. So my request is that your Honor recommend the camp at FCI-Otisville.

And the next thing, and last thing, your Honor, is that he be permitted to self-surrender to whatever facility the BOP designates him to, anytime after October 18th, and that's because the children are going to start school, and he wants to be there just for the beginning, to get them, you know, ingrained in the school year, and then right after that, he's willing to drive himself or his wife or father will drive him directly to the facility.

MS. GATZ: No objection to any of those requests.

THE COURT: Okay. So I will recommend FCI-Otisville, recognizing, of course, that it's not binding on the Bureau of Prisons, but I will recommend that in light of the defendant's strong family ties, and he will self-surrender then sometime on -- on or after October 18th.

MR. SAPONE: So it would be on or after October 19th -- after October 18th, so --

MS. GATZ: I think they like us to pick a date.

12 Can we say October 19th?

MR. SAPONE: Which is a Saturday, so maybe we could just do the 21st or --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GATZ: Monday, the 21st is fine.

THE COURT: Lawyers doing math, that never goes well. Okay, October -- Monday, October 21st, he will self-surrender to the designated facility. If they have not yet designated a facility, he'll surrender to the marshals and take it from there.

MR. SAPONE: Great. And then your Honor, I just want to be clear about something. So your Honor -- and thank you, had recommended FCI-Otisville, but I know that they have a camp, and a low, could your Honor

```
Proceedings
1
   recommend the camp? A low facility, which is a --
 2
              THE COURT: What is a "low"?
 3
              MR. SAPONE: So it goes --
              THE COURT: L-O-W, are you saying?
 4
 5
              MR. SAPONE: Yes, camp, low, medium, high
 6
   security.
 7
              THE COURT: I don't --
              MR. SAPONE: And so --
 8
 9
              THE COURT: -- think I'm in a position to make
10
   that call.
11
              MR. SAPONE: Okay.
12
              THE COURT: Because I don't know what those
13
   things mean, so I will leave that to the Bureau of
14
   Prisons.
              MR. SAPONE: FCI-Otisville is plenty. Thank
15
16
   you.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Good. Now is there a waiver
18
   of appeal?
19
              MS. GATZ: That's a very good question, your
20
   Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Well --
22
              MS. GATZ: I believe so. Let me just look at
23
   the agreement. I don't remember.
24
    (Pause)
25
              MS. GATZ: Yes, your Honor. The defendant
```

waived his right to appeal if the Court sentenced him to 12 months or below.

THE COURT: Okay. So sir, there is a waiver of the appeal in the agreement but you should explore with your attorney whether or not you would like to appeal the sentence. There may be a possibility, I never know about these things, but I do know if you don't appeal within a very, very limited amount of time, you will certainly give up that right.

So you should talk to your attorney about any rights you may have.

Anything else we should cover, for defendants?

MR. SAPONE: No, and thank you, your Honor.

MS. GATZ: Your Honor, does the pretrial supervision continue until October 21st?

MS. GATZ: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Of course. That should've gone without saying but I'm glad you said it, so thank you.

MS. GATZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. We're adjourned.

(Matter concluded)

-000-

#### CERTIFICATE

I, LINDA FERRARA, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this 31st day of October, 2019.

Linda Gerrara Linda Ferrara

AAERT CET 656

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.